DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 274 VT 019 713

AUTHOR Meyer, Judy
TITLE Guide to Proposal Evaluation for Vocational Education of the Handicapped.
INSTITUTION Houston Univ., Tex. Center for Human Resources.
SPONS AGENCY Texas Education Agency, Austin. Div. of Occupational Research and Development.
PUB DATE Sep 72
NOTE 17p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Educational Planning; Educational Programs; Evaluation; *Evaluation Criteria; Guidelines; *Handicapped; *Pilot Projects; *Program Proposals; Research Proposals; Special Education; Statewide Planning; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

In order to evaluate proposals seeking state funds from the Division of Occupational Research and Development of the Texas Education Agency for pilot vocational education programs for the handicapped, there must first be a specific state plan. This state plan should clearly specify first and fifth year goals and resolve whether the primary emphasis is to be integration of special education students into regular vocational classes or maintenance of separate vocational classes for these students. Once the plan has been developed, program priorities can be determined and disseminated to school districts, and local education agencies can be encouraged to submit proposals. Should a proposal fit within the framework of the state plan, it should be evaluated to determine whether it includes the necessary elements and clearly answers such questions as: (1) What is to be done, (2) When is it to be done, (3) Who is responsible, (4) How will it be done, (5) Who are the recipients, (6) What is the desired outcome, and (7) How will the outcome be measured. Sections of this manual discuss the necessary proposal elements and provide an expanded list of questions to use when evaluating a proposal. Sample proposal formats are appended. Related documents are available as VT 019 703, VT 019 712, and VT 019 714 in this issue. (SB)

ED 074274

Guide to Proposal Evaluation for Vocational Education of the Handicapped

by
Judy Meyer

Center for Human Resources
College of Business Administration
University of Houston
Houston, Texas
1972

VT 019713

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 074274

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Guide to Proposal Evaluation for Vocational Education of the Handicapped

Submitted to

The Division of Occupational Research and Development
of the
Texas Education Agency
Under Contracts 29227 and 38155

by

Judy Meyer

Center for Human Resources
College of Business Administration
University of Houston
Houston, Texas
September, 1972

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My appreciation is extended to Mrs. Mary Jane Hatt for summarizing much of the information contained in this report from resource materials sent by many of the states as well as from materials ordered throughout the year. Mrs. Hatt also contributed ideas based on her considerable teaching and administrative experiences in Special Education.

Acknowledgement is accorded to the state of Washington whose letter of intent form, with minor revisions, is suggested for use in Texas in Appendix A; to the state of Ohio for the basic format of Appendix B; and to the many states who sent copies of their respective state guidelines for proposals. This report reflects many ideas gleaned from these guidelines, particularly from documents sent by Georgia, Massachusetts and Minnesota.

GUIDE TO PROPOSAL EVALUATION
FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED

Proposals seeking funding from the State for pilot Vocational Education Programs for the Handicapped need first to be reviewed in context to their applicability to a predetermined state plan for the vocational education of handicapped students. The absence of a specific state plan which clearly defines short range and long range goals for this group perpetuates a fragmented approach and encourages a review of individual proposals in a vacuum.

It seems imperative that, as soon as possible, such a state plan be developed, cooperatively with Vocational Education, Special Education and Texas Rehabilitation Commission. The plan should specify goals for the first year as well as five year goals and must resolve whether the primary emphasis is to be integration of special education students into regular vocational classes (with necessary curriculum adjustments and supportive services) or maintenance of separate vocational classes for these students. Once such a plan has been developed, priorities for program approaches to achieve the goals can be determined and disseminated to all local school districts, Education Service Centers, State Schools/State Hospitals and Junior Colleges. The response of the local educational agencies to the priorities could be quickly determined through encouragement of submission of a brief letter of intent. (See Appendix A for sample.) Such letters of intent could be scanned at the state level, and if found applicable to the priorities as well as indicating a well thought-out program approach, the local agency could be notified to expand the plan or idea into a full proposal.

Once the determination has been made that the proposal fits into the framework of the state plan, an evaluation of each proposal needs to be

undertaken by the state from two perspectives:

One - does the proposal include the necessary elements (or components) for maximized benefit?

Two - does the proposal clearly answer (in the reviewer's mind) the specific questions of:

a. What is to be done?

b. When is it to be done?

c. Who is to be responsible for doing it?

d. How will it be done?

e. Who are the recipients to be?

f. What is the desired outcome for the recipients?

g. How will the outcome be measured?

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MORE STRUCTURED EVALUATIVE CRITERIA TO BE USED BY THE STATE SHOULD NOT BE CONSTRUED (BY THE STATE OR LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS) AS REQUIRING MORE SOPHISTICATED AND COMPLEX PROPOSALS TO BE SUBMITTED.

We are not encouraging mere "grantsmanship" which, from a practical point of view, all but eliminates from consideration for funding the smaller districts who do not have professional proposal writers on their staffs. Rather, this report emphasizes that a proposal should reflect a clear presentation of concise, well thought out plans, and the state should discourage proposals full of vague objectives and ponderous verbiage.

There is considerable feeling that unless a program is written specifically to meet the needs of the handicapped, it is not likely to attain desired outcomes. The handicapped student can and will achieve success only if there is an understanding and recognition of the necessity for

program modifications which will enable him to utilize educational and training processes. Equal treatment, diluted programs or remediation with nonrelevant and redundant presentations are not adequate educational programming for the handicapped.

The most obvious way for the State to insure that vocational programs for handicapped students are well planned and developed to meet the needs of this group is to require specificity in the proposals for such programs. Close scrutiny of a proposal can quickly ascertain the amount of planning and thought which the local school district expended.

An optional format for local school districts to use when submitting a full proposal could be utilization of a separate page for each specific program objective which would encompass the objective, the method to be used to accomplish the objective and the evaluation method to determine whether or not the specific objective has been achieved (see Appendix B). This could assist the local district in showing specific relationships among the objective, the method and the evaluation procedure. It also assists the reviewers of the proposal as the relationships can be quickly seen. However, it should be recognized that the proposal's format is not as important as the state's requirement that the proposal reflects clearly the answers to the questions posed earlier: "What, Who, When, and How?"

The elements which should be included in a proposal as outlined in this report are applicable to integrated vocational programs for handicapped students as well as to separate programs. The important point in a proposal is evidence that the various disciplines necessary to the success of a program for the handicapped recognize the need for, planned for and intend to operate cooperatively to accomplish the goal.

NECESSARY PROPOSAL ELEMENTS

First - There should be statements from each group regarding responsibility for program service delivery; i.e., special education, vocational education, and vocational rehabilitation. The statements should indicate clearly for what services each is to be responsible and should be signed by the local administrator of each. This should become part of the proposal itself.

I. Statement of the Problem

--To be presented in terms of local need.

- To include data on handicapped student population.
- Method for determination of need.

II. Local Resources to Meet the Need and Community Potential

- Should include school resources as well as community agencies, with a brief analysis of the adequacy or inadequacy of the available resources.
- Indication of employment opportunities.

III. Program Objectives

--Must be specific (and measurable).

--Could utilize Appendix B format.

IV. Procedures

--This section should include the following:

- Program design (how does it relate to achieving the objectives?).
- Program location and facilities (location of program administrators, vocational classes, special education classes, proximity to each other).
- Student participation (numbers to be served; procedures and criteria for student identification, recruitment and referral).

- Methods (description of curriculum design, procedures and methods to insure interlocking of special education and vocational education curriculum, materials to be used).

- Evaluation (description of procedures to be used, data to be collected and analyzed, staff responsibility; must relate to the measurement of program objective achievement).

V. Program Administration and Coordination

- Organizational structure (responsibility chart).

- Delineation of Program Responsibility--(who is to be responsible for what functions; how coordination is to be maintained between involved entities). Functions should include:

    1. In-service training
    2. Curriculum development and implementation
    3. Monitoring student progress
    4. Program monitoring (process)
    5. Supportive services
    6. Program evaluation (product)

- Use of employers; advisory groups; community involvement, parental involvement.

- Personnel to be utilized in program, by function (job descriptions and qualifications should be included).

VI. Linkages to Related Programs and Activities

- Coordination to be maintained with "feeder" programs

- Coordination procedures for more advanced programs.

- Specific options available to student completing proposed program.

- Assignment of specific responsibility for student job placement function.

- Assignment of specific responsibility for student follow-up (who, methodology).

VII. Budget

--Should indicate rationale for request.

--Should show relationship with local funds.

--Should indicate source of funds likely to continue program after special funding is terminated.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The following suggested proposal evaluation questions are not meant to require the reviewer to write the answer in a comprehensive evaluation report, but rather are offered to guide the reviewer to see if the proposal has addressed itself to these issues and has answered them. The state must make the decision whether or not to fund proposals which are too vague to answer these questions, but if they are funded, the chances are the resultant program will not be as effective as those programs which presented their plans more clearly.

Proposal Evaluation Questions

Program Component	Does Proposal Clearly Answer These Questions?
Initial Coordination (Vocational Education, Special Education and Vocational Rehabilitation)	Do the signed statements from each discipline indicate the specific responsibility to be assumed? Do the statements show each understands the other's roles and the program's purpose?
Statement of Local Need	Is there a clear need documented? •Is source of data indicated? •Is data relevant, recent and reliable? •Are available resources inadequate? Are there sufficient handicapped students in the district to justify the program? Are there adequte details as to the numbers of students by handicapping category and age levels?

Local Resources and Community Potential	Is there a clear understanding of other community agencies and their roles with handicapped people? Is there an indication of the district's efforts in progressive programming for handicapped students? Is there documentation provided as to employment opportunities in the occupational areas in which training is to be provided?
Program Objectives	Are the objectives specific and measurable? Are the objectives realistic in terms of the population to be served? Are the objectives likely to be accomplished within the program's time frame?
Procedures	
a. Design	Does the procedural design relate precisely to the achievement of the objectives shown?
b. Location-facilities	Are the vocational and special education classes located on the same campus? In close proximity to each other? Is the program location on an appropriate campus? Are the proposed facilities adequate for the occupational areas to be taught?
c. Student participation	Are numbers provided of students who will be participating by age levels and types? Are criteria provided for student selection and referral? Is it clear which staff personnel will be involved in the selection and referral process? Are students to have received vocational evaluation prior to referral? •Who is to be responsible for vocational evaluation? What provisions are made for students who are not successful in the special program?
d. Methods	Do the stated procedures for interlocking vocational education and special education classes appear likely to accomplish the desired effect?

Is coordination responsibility between the two disciplines clearly delineated?

Is responsibility for curriculum development, planning and modification defined?

Is the teacher-to-student ratio within the prescribed state limit?

Do teaching methods include field trips and other work related activities?

Is there an interdisciplinary team approach planned?

Are program modifications planned to allow for individualized instruction and schedule flexibility?

Are there adequate materials planned to meet the stated program needs?

Can students be placed on shortened or lengthened days in accordance to their instructional needs?

e. Evaluation

Do the evaluation procedures relate to measurement of achieving program objectives?

Is the evaluation plan simple and practical?

Is staff responsibility clear for data collection and analysis?

- Are there provisions for pre-tests?
- Are there provisions for post-tests?
- Are regular progress tests to be given?
- How often are student progress forms to be completed?
- What type of individual student records are to be kept?
- Will these insure that student progress can be measured accurately?
- Is there a plan to keep student records up-dated?

Program Administration and Coordination	Are there clear supervisory lines shown in the organizational structure chart?
	Are specific responsibilities designated to staff personnel in the areas of in-service training? Curriculum deve'opment and implementation? Monitoring student progress? Program (process) monitoring? Supportive services? Program evaluation (product)? Program modification based on evaluation? Is the method for and amount of involvement of employers, parents, and community clear?
	Are personnel to be utilized in the program designated functionally? Is it clear what part their function fills in achieving the program objectives?
Linkages to Related Programs and Activities	Is there evidence that "feeder" programs will prepare students for entry into this program? Are there provisions for providing information to the "feeder" programs based on students' participation in this program?
	Are the options clear as to what the students' next progressive step is after completion of this program?
	Is there a specific method for referring a student into a more advanced program?
	Who is responsible for seeing that he is involved with the next program?
	Is staff responsibility assigned for job placement?
	Is staff responsibility assigned for follow-up?
	If not a staff responsibility, is whoever responsible aware of this responsibility and have they accepted it (in writing)?
Budget	Is budget prepared on authorized state forms?
	Does the instructional plan justify the equipment and materials requested?
	Is there indication of a financial base for program continuation after termination of special funding?

PROPOSAL EVALUATION SUMMARY

	Unintelligible	Vague	Clear
Program Rationale			
Program Objectives			
Program Development (timing of events)			
Program Methods			
Program Evaluation			
Staff Functions			
Program Participant Group to be served			
Program Interlocking Between Vocational Education and Special Education			
Program Coordination and Linkages			
Administrative Support			

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
STATE OF TEXAS

Division of Occupational Research and Development

LETTER OF INTENT FOR A SPECIAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROJECT
UNDER P. L. 90-576 FOR THE 1973-74 SCHOOL YEAR

District _____ County _____

Address _____

_____
Signature of Vocational Director

_____
Signature of Special Education Director

_____
Signature of Applicant District Superintendent

_____
Signature of Local Texas Rehabilitation Commission Supervisor

Date _____

Name of Each Participating District (if applicable) _____

_____

TYPE OF PROJECT

Handicapped (Part B Funds) _____ Separated Program _____

Integrated Program _____

GRADE LEVELS OF STUDENTS SERVED

Junior High School _____ Senior High School _____

DURATION OF PROJECT: Beginning Date _____ Termination Date _____

STUDENTS TO PARTICIPATE

age level	number students	handicapping category

TOTAL PROBABLE COST:

$ _____

_____
Total

Average Cost Per Student $_____

SPECIAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROJECT FOR THE 1973-74 SCHOOL YEAR:

1. Objectives of Project(What specific behaviors do you expect to modify or develop?)

_____

_____

_____

_____

2. Description of Project (please limit to 50 words.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Description of Special Services Required by and Provided to Students to be Enrolled (Please check those services that apply.)

(a) Testing _____
(b) Guidance and Counseling _____
(c) Career Exploration _____
(d) Remedial Basic Education _____
(e) Employability Skills Training _____
(f) Special Educational Equipment, Devices _____

(g) Other (Describe) _____

_____

_____

_____

4. Evaluation of Project (How do you propose to determine whether you have satisfied your objectives?)

_____

_____

_____

Mail completed LETTER OF INTENT to:

Mr. John R. Guemple
Associate Commissioner of Occupational Education and Technology
Texas Education Agency
201 E. 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

APPENDIX B
OPTIONAL PROPOSAL FORMAT

Specific Objective

Methods or Procedures (Indicate sequentially what is to be done to meet this objective, how it will be done, who is responsible and who the participants are)

Evaluation (Specify how it is to be determined if this objective has been met)